



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Song of the Virgin, taken from the 1st chapter of St. Luke's Gospel, is one of the appointed hymns directed to be read or sung immediately after the 1st lesson, in which it is expressly stated that "all generations shall call her blessed."

It is, therefore, obvious that the Church of England honours the Blessed Virgin and other undoubted saints of the primitive Church; and that the point of difference between her and the Church of Rome is, whether the latter does not err as to the kind of honour due to her and them.

The Church of Rome is not satisfied with giving honour to the saints, according to their dignity, but she *suppliantly invokes* their aid; and the question which remains is, what does this *invocation* mean or imply? and is it warranted by either Scripture, or reason, or the practice of that comparatively pure age of the Church, by which we have tried so many other peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome—the first three centuries?

The Council of Trent (sess. xxv., de Invoc.) expressly asserts that "it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke the saints, and to resort to their prayers, aid, and help, for obtaining benefits from God."*

Now, what does this *invocation* mean or imply? Mr. Keenan, whose controversial catechism we have before alluded to, asserts, roundly, that "(Roman) Catholics do not ask grace from the saints; they merely ask the saints to pray that God may grant them all necessary graces, through Christ." They say, when addressing God, "Have mercy on us; forgive our sins;" but, when addressing the Blessed Virgin, or the saints, "Pray for us." Whether this be practically true, we shall see presently; but we would first inquire, what *invocation* means?

"To invoke the saints suppliantly," as recommended or enjoined by the Council of Trent, is, in plain English, to call on the saints in our prayers, or to *pray to them*; and that *prayer* to any unseen being involves religious worship, we think will scarcely be controverted by the most zealous advocate of the Church of Rome. Whether the prayers be to them as *intercessors* merely, or as the *direct dispensers* of grace, assistance, and safety, or whether they amount to what the Church of Rome attempts to distinguish as *Latria* or not, without doubt such prayers are an act of religious worship, very different in kind from any mere honour, or petition offered to any fellow-creature on earth, however elevated in power or rank.

That the Fathers thought prayer a mode of addressing God alone, is proved by numberless passages in which they uniformly define it with express reference to God and no other.

TERTULLIAN, A.D. 190, says in his apology for the Christians of his time—"Those things I may not pray for from any other, but from Him of whom I know I shall obtain them; because, both it is He who is alone able to give, and I am he unto whom it appertaineth to obtain that which is requested, being His servant, who observe Him alone."†

CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, A.D. 200, defines prayer by its relation to God.

"Since there is but one good God, both we and angels *pray to Him alone*, that those good things may be given us which we want, and those continued which we have."‡

So **ORIGEN**, A.D. 230, in his writings against Celsus, (who had said of the demons that they belong to God, and in that respect were to be prayed to, that they may be favourable to us), thus replies—"Away with Celsus's counsel, saying, that we must pray to demons; for we must pray to him who is God over all; and we must pray to the Word of God, his only begotten Son, and the first-born of all creatures; and we must entreat him, that he, as High Priest, would present our prayer to his God and our God."§

"Prayer," says **ST. BASIL**, A.D. 370, "is a request of some good thing, which is made by pious men unto God."||

"Prayer," says **GREGORY NYSSEN**, A.D. 380, "is a conversing, or a conference with God."¶

"Prayer," says **ST. CHRYSOSTOM**, A.D. 400, "is a colloquy, or discourse with God."**

"Prayer," says **JOHN DAMASCEN**, A.D. 780, "is an ascension of the mind unto God, or a request of things that are fit from God."††

Now, as the Holy Scriptures assuredly do not teach us, any more than the early Fathers, to *pray to saints*, either as benefactors or intercessors, the next question is, what did the early Fathers think of *invocation*? did they distinguish it from *prayer*? and did they, or not, consider it a form of worship properly due to God only?

We need not here go back even so far as the third century, for the great **ST. ATHANASIUS**, in the fourth century, is conclusive on the matter. "We are," says he, "truly worshippers of God; because we *invoke no one of the creatures*, nor any mere man, but the Son, who is, by nature, from God, and true God: made man, indeed, yet

* "Boūm atque utile suppliciter eos invocare et ob beneficia impetrantia Deo, ad eorum orationes, open, auxiliante confugere." † Apologeticus adversus Gentes, cap. 30, p. 67. ed. Rigit. Paris, 1635.

‡ οὐδεὶς εἰκότως ἐνὸς ὄντος τῇ ἀγαθῇ θεοῦ παρὰ αὐτῷ μόνα τῶν ἀγαθῶν τὰ μὲν δοξῆνται τὰ δὲ παραπεῖναι τύχαμεθα ἡμεῖς τε κάτιον ἀγέλεσθαι.—Strom. I. 7, p. 853. Oper. Ed. Potteri. Oxon. 1715.

§ Origen Cont. Cels. lib. 8, oper. tom. i, Bened. ed. p. 761. Paris, 1723.

¶ Basil. Orat. in Julittam Martyr. Op. tom. ii, p. 35.

|| Greg. Nyssen, Orat. i, de oratione.

** Chrysost. in Genes. homil. 30, Op. tom. i, p. 301—*ride same*, lib. I, De orando Dein. Op. tom. ii, p. 778.

†† Damascen de fide orthodoxa, lib. iii, c. 24.

not the less, therefore, the Lord himself, and God, and Saviour."*

So **NOVATIAN**, a presbyter of the Roman Church, in the third century, argues that Christ is God, because he is everywhere invoked. "If Christ was only a man, how, when *invoked*, is he everywhere present; for omnipresence is the nature not of man, but of God?"†

So **ST. AMBROSE**, A.D. 390, in his funeral oration on the Emperor Theodosius, says—"Thou alone art to be *invoked*, O Lord; thou are to be requested to supply the want of him in his son."‡

IRENEUS, § A.D. 180, in his second book against heretics, says—"As the Church has freely received from the Lord, so does she freely minister; nor does she do anything by *invocation of angels*, nor by incantations, but purely and manifestly directs her *prayers to God*, who made all, and calls upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ."

So **ORIGEN** (cont. Cels. lib. v, p. 580. opera. Benedict. Ed. Paris, 1733) says—"All supplications, and prayer, and intercession, and thanksgiving, we must offer up to God, who is above all, through the living Word of God, who is a High Priest, superior to all angels. To *invoke* angels, indeed, when men know so little about them, were itself irrational; but, even on the supposition that we were ever so well acquainted with such mysterious wonders, still this very supposed knowledge, while it was setting forth their nature and their respective offices, would forbid us presumptuously to pray to any other than the all-sufficient Deity, through the Son of God our Saviour."

We shall merely add here the canon of the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 364, the decrees of which were received and approved of by the whole Church (cap. 35)—"That Christians ought not to forsake the Church of God, and depart aside and *invoke* angels; therefore, if any man be found using this secret *idolatry*, let him be accursed, because he hath forsaken our Lord Jesus Christ."

In the epitome of the canons which Pope Adrian delivered to Charles the Great, this decree is thus abridged—"Ut anathema sit, quicumque relicta ecclesia angelos colere, vel congregations facere presumperit." "That whosoever, leaving the Church, did presume to worship angels, or to make meetings, should be accursed."

This condemnation of prayers to angels as idolatrous was occasioned by a sect of heretics in the fourth century, who, for the purpose of exercising this unlawful worship of praying to angels, held private meetings, separate from those of the Church, in which it was not permitted; and no one ever doubted that the Council would have equally condemned, on the same principle, prayers to saints, if such had been practised in their time.

In all these passages the essential identity of religious *invocation* and *prayer* is clearly implied; and it clearly never entered into the conception of any of these ancient Fathers, that we could *pray to* any being without *worshipping* them.

The very word *adoration* is obviously taken from *adorare*, which literally is *to pray to*.

Now, would it be possible to show more strongly that it was deemed by the Church of the first, second, third, and fourth centuries, that *invocation* was a thing proper to God only; and that it necessarily implied the *omnipresence* of the Being invoked? It will be obviously to ascribe one of the attributes of Deity to a creature, a thing which could not be done without impiety, or, indeed, *idolatry*.

Let us next hear the great **ST. AUGUSTINE**, A.D. 400—"Let not our point of religion be the *worship of dead men*; for though they lived piously, still they are not to be so accounted of, as seeking from us any such honours; but they rather wish us to worship Him, through whose illumination they rejoice that we should be associates of their merit. They are to be honoured, therefore, on account of imitation; not to be *prayed to*, on account of religion."||

* Άλλα αληθως θεοπετείς, ότι μηδένα των γεννητων, μη δε κοινον τινα ανθρώπων, αλλα τον εκ Θεου φυσει και αληθινον Θεον ινον επικαλουμεθα. Athan. Contr. Ar. Orat. iii, Op. Tom. i, p. 582. Ben. Ed. Paris, 1698.

† Sed homo tantummodo Caristus, quemodo adest ubique invocatur, atque invocatio hominis ad praestandum salutem inefficax judicatur. —Nov. de Trin. c. xiv., Page 747. Oper. Tertull. Rigit. Paris, 1735.

This treatise was frequently attributed to Tertullian or Cyprian, even in the time of St. Jerome, as he remarks. Cat. dog. Script. Eccl. c. 81, and *Apolog.* Cont. Ruffin. lib. ii. Natalis Alexander has shown that the doctrine of this treatise is sound.—Hist. Eccl., sec. ii, Dissert. ix, art. iv. Tom. iii, p. 411. Paris, 1714.

‡ Sed tanquam tu solus, Domine, invocandus es; tu rogandus, ut enim in filiis representes.—Ambrose, op. tom. ii, p. 1207. Bened. ed. Paris, 1610.

§ Nec *invocationibus* angelicis facti aliquid, nec *incantationibus*, nec reliqua prava curiositate, sed munus et pure et manifeste *orationes* origines ad Dominum, qui omnia fecit, et nomen Domini rostri *christi invocans*.—Advers. Hæres. lib. 2 (c. 51), c. xxiii, ed. Bened., p. 104. Paris, 1710.

|| Οτι ον δι Χριστιανούς έγκαταλείπειν τὴν εκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἀπίναι και ἀγάθεσ τον ουρανούς συνάσκεις ποιεῖ, ἀπερ ἀπηγόρευται. Ετις οὖν επέθη ταντη τη εκκριμενη εἰδωλολατρία σχολάζων ἀνάθημα ὅτι έγκατελεῖτε τον κύριον ήμῶν Ιησούν Χριστον, τον νίνο τον θεον, και εἰδωλολατρία προσήλθετο.—Concl. Laod. Can. 35. Pandecta Canonum Apost. lib. 1, Oxon, 1672, p. 463.

¶ Non sit nobis religio cultus hominum mortuum. Quia, si pie viximus, non sic habentur, ut tales querant homines: sed illum a nobis coll volunt, quo illuminante laetatur meritum sui nos esse consortes. Honorable sunt ergo propter imitationem, non adorandi propter religionem.—August. de ver relig. c. iv., Oper. vol. i, p. 786. Bened. Ed. Paris, 1710.

A further reason for not praying to them might be mentioned, which no less writer than Cardinal Cajetan candidly acknowledges, viz.:—"That we have no means of certainly knowing whether the saints hear our prayers" (which would destroy, at one blow, the whole system of invoking them). "though," adds the cardinal, "we plausibly believe this to be the case."* Why there should be any piety in believing a thing without any proof either from the Holy Scriptures, or the ancient Fathers of the Church, we are at a loss to imagine, unless *piety* and *credulity* are to be deemed identical!

We would add one more out of many early authorities, that of St. EPIPHANIUS, Bishop of Salamis, in the Island of Cyprus, in the fourth century (A.D. 370), who, after censoring, at great length, the Collyridian heretics, for invoking the Blessed Virgin as a sort of goddess, and declaring that Christians ought not indecorously to venerate the saints, but rather He who is their Sovereign Lord and Master, sums up the whole with the following admonition, which is perhaps scarcely less needed in the present day than it was in the days of the nascent Collyridian heresy:—"Let Mary be held in honour; but let the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost be worshipped. *As for Mary, let no one worship her.*"†

We think we are now in a position to assert, that the *invocation* of saints was not the practice of the ancient Church in primitive times, unless some of our learned Roman Catholic correspondents are able to overthrow the authorities we have quoted (which, of course, they will do, if they can), either by proving that we have misrepresented or mistaken them, or by showing from other writers of the same or earlier dates, that such writers as Ireneus, St. Athanasius, St. Epiphanius, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine do not truly represent the opinions of the primitive Church on the subject. It is difficult, indeed, to imagine how any men, who have sworn to abide by the unanimous consent of the Fathers, can dare to appeal to Catholic antiquity in justification of praying to any created beings, in the face of such authorities as we have above cited.

We propose in our next number to proceed to consider what has been said by the principal controversial writers of the Church of Rome, which we think will corroborate, instead of countervailing, what we have above written, when we find to what shifts they are driven in their attempt to trace back the present practices of their Church to the times of our Lord and his Apostles; and we shall also endeavour to show in what manner the corrupt practice of saint-worship gradually was introduced, and to what lengths it has led its votaries even in the present day.

WHAT IS THE EVIDENCE ON WHICH PURGATORY IS BELIEVED?

The very important question, which we have put at the head of our present article, is one which has been so frequently discussed in our pages, that it is now time to examine what is the result of our inquiries. And first let us see—Is Purgatory believed on the evidence of Scripture? Only one of our correspondents (vol. i, p. 45) has attempted to bring forward any Scriptural authorities for the existence of such a place. We found it easy to show, however, that the texts that he alleged were quite irrelevant; and, in order not to be suspected of urging weak objections to his proofs, we stated our arguments in the words of Natalis Alexander, an able and learned Roman Catholic divine. We may state, then, as the result of our inquiries, that there is not a single mention of Purgatory in the whole of the New Testament. Now, could this be so, if the writers of the New Testament knew of the existence of such a place? If the pains of Purgatory can be shortened by men's prayers and penances in this life, how is it that the Apostles never appear to have given their converts a word of instruction, as to the means of escaping these sufferings hereafter? They wrote also, to men suffering severe persecutions; and, yet, among all the consolations they offered them, they never seem to have thought of reminding them how their sufferings in this life would abridge the time of their punishment in Purgatory.

Well, but, perhaps, the silence of Scripture may be supplied by tradition. Let us examine then,

Is Purgatory believed on the evidence of any of the orthodox writers of the first three centuries? Here, again, we have to answer that not a single quotation in proof of Purgatory has been established; and that certainly not for want of pains on the part of our Roman Catholic correspondents. They have given us quotations from later writers: they have given us quotations from heretical writers of the first three centuries; they have proved from orthodox writers that *prayers for the dead* were used at an early time, in the primitive Church; but of Purgatory, not a word. We feel, then, that we are justified in concluding, that in whatever manner the belief in Purgatory came into the Church,

* Certe ratione nescimus, an Sancti nostra vota cognoscant, quoniam p.d. hoc credamus. *Cajetanus* in secundum secundae *Quæst.* lxxvii. art. 5. Aug. Taur. 1581, p. 411.

† Τι τιμη ἔστω Μάρια ὁ δὲ Πατήρ, καὶ Υἱός, καὶ Ἀγέλη Πνεῦμα, προσκυνέσθω τὴν Μάριαν μηδεὶς προσεντεῖ. —Epiph. Cont. Hæres. lib. iii, tom. ii, hæs. 79, p. 104. Paris ed. 1622; Colon, 1682.—Honoretur sancta Maria: Pater vero, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus adorantur—Mariam adorare nemo velit.

it was not derived by tradition from Christ and his Apostles.

Is there no mention of Purgatory prior to the fourth century? Certainly there is. The heathens had a doctrine very much resembling it. We have quoted a statement from Plato (vol. i., p. 16); and a correspondent (vol. ii., p. 58) has sent us Virgil's description of his Purgatory, which corresponds almost exactly with the notions as to the state of the dead now entertained in the Roman Catholic Church. Here, then, we begin to get an answer to the question—If the notion of Purgatory was not derived from Christ and his Apostles, where did it come from? We find reason to suspect that this doctrine was one of the importations from a heathen philosophy, with which the simplicity of the Gospel was corrupted.

But who imported this heathen doctrine into Christianity? Our correspondents have enabled us to answer this question, too. They have pointed to some writers, notorious for their heretical opinions, as the earliest Christian authorities, which can be adduced in support of this doctrine. Origen, who was well learned in heathen systems of philosophy, had speculations concerning the state of the dead, which, in some measure, resemble those now held in the Roman Catholic Church. He believed in a Purgatory, but one of far greater efficiency than hers; he thought there was no sin too great for the fires of his Purgatory to purge out, and that even the devil himself would, in process of time, be rendered pure enough for admission into the kingdom of heaven. In short, Origen's Purgatory was what we call hell, only that he believed there would be an end to its duration. Another Christian writer, notorious for the unsoundness of his views on some subjects, has been brought forward in support of Purgatory—we mean Tertullian. But Tertullian expressly tells us that he learned this notion, not from the Church, but from a wretched fanatic, named Montanus, by whose pretensions to inspiration, Tertullian was unfortunately deceived.

The conclusion, then, to which the labours of our correspondents have led us is, that writers notorious for the unsoundness of their doctrines, are responsible for the introduction of this notion into the Christian Church.

So much for the first three centuries; but what as to those succeeding? Well, we maintain that after this time notions resembling Purgatory may be found in the speculations of individual writers, but that Purgatory was no part of the doctrine of the Church during the fourth and fifth centuries.

It was natural that the curiosity of man should busy itself with speculations as to the state of the soul after death; and it was not wonderful that the notions entertained by a writer of so much learning and ingenuity as Origen should obtain considerable circulation; but we hold that whatever may have been the private opinions of individual writers, their notions did not receive the sanction of the Church. We can prove this, first, by negative evidence: the absence—namely, of all mention of Purgatory from the creeds, and from the canons of councils of the Church, for many centuries. We prove it further from the vagueness and the uncertainty of the language of those who express any opinion at all resembling those held in modern times concerning Purgatory. We have already alluded to the embarrassment of Epiphanius (see vol. ii., p. 68), when asked why he prayed for the dead. Instead of answering plainly, “to get their souls out of Purgatory,” as any one would who believed in the existence of such a place, he makes a far less satisfactory defence, and takes his stand principally on the impropriety of deviating from a custom established in the Church. We could show, also, how unsettled the views of these writers were as to the efficacy of these prayers; some even holding that the pains of the damned were alleviated by the prayers of the Church. But we shall not need to go further than Augustine. This eminent Father lived at the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century. If the doctrine of Purgatory formed part of the doctrine of the Church in his day, he could not have failed to have known and believed it. If, therefore, we can show that he had nothing to offer on this subject, but guesses and probable conjectures, the conclusion is inevitable that the doctrine of Purgatory formed no part of the system of Christian truth which had been handed down to him by his predecessors. How far this is the case, our readers will judge from the following extracts:—

Augustine takes pains to argue against those who held Origen's notions of a Purgatory which should, in time, remove all men's sins, and who defended themselves by appealing to 1 Cor. iii. 13. Augustine, in reply, interprets the wood, hay, stubble, spoken of, as representing the over-great love which the faithful bear to the things of life; and the fire as representing that temporal tribulation which causes them grief by the loss of those things whereupon they had fixed their affections. “But,” he proceeds, “whether in this life only men suffer such things, or whether some such judgments also follow after this life, the meaning which I have given of this sentence is, as I suppose, not inconsistent with the truth.” *

* Sive ergo in hac vita tantum homines ista patiantur, sive etiam post hanc vitam talia quendam iudicia subsequantur: non abhorret,

Again, he writes, “That some such thing should take place after this life is not incredible, and whether it be so may be a subject for inquiry, and may be either found or may remain hidden: that some of the faithful, through a certain Purgatorial fire, are so much the more slowly or sooner saved by how much more or less they have loved these perishing goods.” *

We give one more quotation to the same effect. “If it be said that in the interval between death and the day of judgment the spirits of the departed suffer a fire—not felt by those who have not had such dispositions and affections in their mortal life, that their wood, hay, and stubble shall be consumed, but felt by those who have carried with them buildings of this kind; whether they feel the fire of transitory tribulation burning those secular affections (which are pardoned from damnation) in this world only, or both here and there, or, therefore here that they may not feel it there—I do not contradict it, for, perhaps, it is true.”†

PERHAPS it is true!! So, then, in Augustine's time, so late as the beginning of the fifth century, notions akin to Purgatory had not got beyond “perhaps.” This is an argument so decisive against the claims of Purgatory to rank among articles of faith, as to outweigh dozens of quotations on the other side, if it were possible to produce them. All that such quotations could prove, would be that there was such a place as Purgatory, in the private opinion of the writer cited; but if the Church had any tradition on the subject, Augustine would not have needed to speak with a “perhaps” on the matter.

But how, then, did Purgatory attain the rank of an article of faith? Is theology a science which admits of discoveries? and is it possible to obtain in the sixth century a knowledge of truths which those who were taught by the Apostles were ignorant of? There is no evidence for Purgatory unless it be asserted that it is possible for late ages to find out something which the first centuries were ignorant of; and, accordingly, some Roman Catholic divines have been bold enough to make this assertion. We quoted (vol. ii., p. 68) the honest confession of Cardinal Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, “Whoever reads the commentaries of the ancient Greeks, will find no mention, as far as I can see, or the slightest possible concerning Purgatory. Nay, even the Latins did not all at once, but gradually enter into the truth of this matter. . . . For a while it was unknown; at a later date it was known to the Church universal; then it was believed by some, by little and little, partly from Scripture, partly from revelations.” *Assert. Luther. Confut. 18.*

When we quoted this passage before, we added that the revelations here spoken of, by which Purgatory is proved, were, in plain English, neither more nor less than ghost stories. As this explanation has not been relished by some of our Roman Catholic readers, we proceed to establish our assertions, although in order to do so we must come down as low as the sixth century.

To prove, however, that we are going to the right place, we cite the following from Mr. Faber's work elsewhere referred to:—

“The dialogue of St. Gregory the Great may be considered as the chief fountain of the devotion to the holy souls in all succeeding ages; and Father Peter Faber used to say that, although St. Gregory was a saint, who should be loved and honoured, on many accounts, yet on none more than this, because he had so lucidly and transparently handed down to us the doctrine of the purgatorial fire. For he thought that if St. Gregory had not told us so many things of the holy souls, the devotion of subsequent ages would have been much colder in their behalf.”—Page 385.

Now, Pope Gregory founds his doctrine of Purgatory, as Cardinal Fisher has it, on Scripture and revelation; only that there is very little of Scripture and a great deal of revelation. What he quotes from Scripture tells rather *against* than *for* Purgatory. When asked whether we are to believe in the existence of a purgatorial fire after death, he replies—“The Lord says in the Gospel, ‘Walk while ye have the light.’ He says, also, by the prophet, ‘I have heard thee in the accepted time, and have called thee in the day of salvation;’ in explanation of which text, the Apostle Paul says, ‘Behold, now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation.’ Solomon, likewise, says, ‘Whatever thy hand can do, work with all thy might; for there is neither work, nor knowledge, nor understanding, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou art hastening.’ From which sentences we must infer that such as any

quantum arbitror a ratione veritatis iste intellectus hujus sententio.”—De Octo Dilectis Questionibus, Quesit. i. See also De Fide and Operibus, cap. 16.

* Tale aliquid etiam post hanc vitam fieri incredibile non est, et utrum ita sit queri potest, et aut inveniri aut latere; nouissimos fideles perigrinem quemadmodum purgatorium, quanto magis minusve bona pereunt, tanto tardius citiusve salvari.”—Eusebii, cap. 69.

† Post iustius sane corporis mortem donec ad illum venturam, quod post resurrectionem corporum futurus est damnationis et remunerationis ultimus dies, ad hoc temporis intervallo spiritus defunctorum eju-modi ignem dicuntur perpeti, quem non sentiant illi qui non habuerunt tales mores et amores in hujus corporis vita ut eorum lignum et stipula consumantur; illi vero sentiant qui ejusmodi secundum aedificia portaverunt, sive ibi tantum, sive hic et ibi, sive ideo hic non ibi, saecularia, quamvis a damnatione venientia, concremantem ignem transitoriae tribulationis inventant, non redarguo, quia forsitan terrenum est.—De Civ. Dei, lib. xxi., c. 25.

one departs hence, such shall he appear in the day of judgment.” So far Pope Gregory's Scripture arguments conclude against Purgatory; but he goes on—“However, we must believe that there is a purgatorial fire for some trifling faults, inasmuch as the Truth says, that ‘if any man speak blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, it shall be forgiven him neither in this world nor in the world to come;’ from which sentence we are given to understand that some sins may be remitted in this world and some in the next. . . . But, yet, as I said, this last can only be believed of some very small and trifling sins, such as idle words, immoderate laughter, &c., which do not seem grievous faults, but will become grievous matters after death if any one neglect them while yet in this life. For when St. Paul says that Christ is the foundation, he adds, ‘If any man build on this foundation, &c. (see 1 Cor. iii.).’ Now, though this may be understood of the fire of tribulation in this life, yet if any one understand it of a fire of future purgation, he ought to consider carefully that he is saved by fire, not who builds on it lead or iron—that is, heavy and grievous sins; but wood, hay, stubble—that is, small sins, such as the fire can easily consume. You should know, too, that no one shall obtain any purgation by fire for his small sins, unless he has merited, by his good actions in this life, that he shall obtain it there.”—*Dialog.*, lib. iv., c. 39.

Such is Gregory's Scripture proof of Purgatory. It will be perceived that the general tenor of Scripture is pronounced by him unfavourable to the doctrine; that he is induced to admit it by a very illogical inference from the text which says that the sin against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven in the next world, from which he gathers that some other sins shall; and, lastly, that he thinks the celebrated passage of St. Paul, in 1 Cor., may be understood of Purgatory, though it admits of another interpretation.

The kind of Purgatory which Pope Gregory admits of, falls very far short of what is now commonly believed in the Church of Rome, being only adapted to the purgation of the very smallest sins of those who have earned a claim for admission by their good actions in this life. There are a great many of those for whom Masses are now said and paid for, who would not be thought good enough for admission into Pope Gregory's Purgatory.

But the chief stress of Gregory's proof of Purgatory lies on *revelations*. He admits the novelty of his teaching on this head. His collocutor, Peter, asks him, ch. 40—“What is the reason that in these last times so many things are known about souls, which were before concealed, so that the future world appears to disclose itself by open revelations and visions?” To which Gregory answers—“Just so; for as this present world is approaching to an end, so much is the next world touched by our very nearness to it, and is disclosed by more manifest signs.”

As, however, we find that Pope Gregory, who died A.D. 604, 1250 years ago, was mistaken in supposing himself near to the end of the world, it is possible that he may have been also mistaken in the credence which he gave to ghost stories on that supposition; and any one who will take the trouble to look over his Dialogues, will find the good Father more remarkable for simple credulity than for wise discrimination. We shall give a couple of specimens of his stories. The reader will observe that he does not speak of Purgatory as a *place*; but he describes the souls as suffering in parts of this earth. We suppose that Purgatory being newly opened in his time, it had not then become worth while to set up a separate establishment, and the souls were like prisoners out on tickets-of-leave before it had become worth while to build a prison for them.

The first story we cite is of one Paschasius, a deacon of the Church of Rome, a man of wonderful sanctity, bountiful in alms-giving, and remarkable for self-denial. However, in a contested election for the bishopric of Rome, he voted on the wrong side—for Laurentius against Symmachus—and persisted in his preference to his dying day. He worked a miracle at his funeral—a demoniac touched the “dalmatic” placed on his bier, and immediately recovered. Notwithstanding, some time after, Bishop Germanus having been ordered by his physicians to use the hot baths of St. Angelo, when he went into the baths, found the said Paschasius standing there. So he was greatly surprised, and asked him what so great a man was doing there? To which Paschasius replied, that he was in that place of punishment for no other reason than because he took the side of Laurentius against Symmachus. But he begged Germanus to pray for him, telling him that he would know that he had been successful, if he did not find him there on his next visit. And, accordingly, Germanus did not find him there when he came again.

Hot baths seem to have been the favourite substitute for Purgatory in Pope Gregory's time. He tells another story about a Presbyter, who lived near Civita Vecchia, and was in the habit of using hot baths; and who one day on going in found a certain unknown person prepared to wait on him, who took off his shoes, took his clothes from him, brought him towels when he came out, &c. This went on so often that the Presbyter said to himself one day, “I must not behave shabbily to that man who waits on me so devotedly at the baths; but I must take

him a present. So he took him two of the offertory cakes. He found the man there as usual, and was waited on by him as before. And when he was dressed and going out he gave the man the present he had brought, by way of thanking him, begging him to take it kindly in token of charity. But the man, sorrowing, said, why do you give me this, Father? It is holy bread, I cannot eat it. I was once the master of this place, and have been sent here for my sins. If you wish to do me any good, offer it to God for me, and you will know your prayers are heard, if, when you come to bathe next, you do not find me here. Then he vanished, and the Presbyter saw by his vanishing that he who he thought was a man, really was a ghost. And when he came back after a week's prayer and Masses the man was no longer to be seen.

Now, we shall not discuss here what credit is due to these stories; our object in bringing them forward here is to show exactly on what foundation Purgatory rests, and at what a late period the belief of it was introduced into the Church. We have said elsewhere, that some modern Romanists have forsaken the Tridentine standard for a triple rule of faith—Scripture, tradition, and revelation. Now, the proof for Purgatory from Scripture and tradition altogether breaks down; and we wish it to be clearly seen that asserted recitations formed the ground on which the doctrine was first received, and by means of which its belief was fastened on the Christian Church for a number of years.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have been obliged to postpone several articles and letters from want of room.

We would request our correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JUNE, 1854.

THE intolerance with which the Church of Rome is often charged by her opponents has not unfrequently been defended as necessary to uphold her unity and immutability, which unity her advocates say could not be maintained were she to tolerate differences within her pale, as other Churches, not endowed with the same Divine authority, are compelled to do.

We have little doubt that the principal attraction which has drawn some men of respectable attainments from the Church of England to that of Rome, has been the idea of the much-boasted unity and immutability of the latter, with the stricter discipline exercised in upholding them.

That the Church of Rome, however, is tolerant enough, and even flexible enough, towards all who will even nominally submit to the all-important doctrine of her supremacy, appears to be pretty well practically understood in the present day, as, indeed, in all ages.

Great as her power has been and still is, there is always a wary prudence used in its exercise.

Of this we might give many instances, but let a few suffice—some of which we shall take from the conduct of the Holy See towards large classes, the rest from the conduct of the hierarchy towards individuals.

Those who have read the CATHOLIC LAYMAN since its commencement, will remember the signal toleration shown by the See of Rome towards the protracted and angry combat between the Franciscan and Dominican orders, touching the much-disputed doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary—which, after 300 years' discussion, with all the acknowledged prepossessions of the Holy See in its favour, has never yet, we believe, been definitely determined by the Church of Rome.

A similar toleration has been evinced by the Holy See towards the order of the Jesuits, who have, from time to time, published books containing the most dangerous and indefensible doctrines, not one of which has ever been prohibited by the Church of Rome, though she professes to condemn and prohibit the use of all bad books, and publishes, from time to time, such prohibitions in her Index Prohibitorius.

How are we to account for such toleration; and how is it consistent with her intolerance and persecution towards every attempt at reformation? Simply because she does not feel powerful enough to measure her strength with large and influential bodies within her own pale; and, therefore, could not prudently venture on what she knew would have been a vain attempt to put down a schism between two angry and powerful parties, both of which were willing to acknowledge her nominal supremacy, as long as she did not venture to exercise it against themselves; and because, in like manner, the Jesuit order is willing to give cordial support to all her pretensions, so long as she does not interfere with the doctrines and principles on which their system is founded.

Let us glance now at her dealing with individuals. The last week has witnessed the solemn inaugural profession of faith of the Very Rev. Dr. John Henry Newman, as rector of the newly-founded Roman Catholic University of Ireland. On this occasion the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen, titular Archbishop of Dublin, pronounced a discourse, in which, in the same breath, he proclaimed the unchangeable character of the doctrines of his Church, and held forth Dr. Newman as a man distinguished for his profound learning, as well as for his virtues and piety; while it is notorious, from Dr. Newman's own works, that he ventures to differ most widely from the Church of Rome on, at least, one cardinal point of the gravest importance to her theory and pretensions—her much-boasted immutability. In his celebrated essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine, Dr. Newman maintains that God did not intend that the form of doctrine, received in the Church, should be at all times the same; that He left in his Church an authority of developing new truths from those known before; so that it is not needful that Romish Christianity and Apostolic Christianity should be one and the same thing—that, in point of fact, they are two different things; thus throwing overboard the whole theory of Apostolic tradition as constituting, together with the Scriptures, the rule of faith, and resting everything on the inherent power of the Church to declare authoritatively what she thinks right, independently of both Scripture and tradition.

All Romish controversialists, except Dr. Newman, have contended that the Church of Rome has been immutably the same in doctrine in all ages, and that whatever she holds at this day is identical with what she derived in the earliest times from our Lord and his Apostles, either through the written Word, or oral tradition from the Apostles themselves.

Now, how comes the Church of Rome, through one of her highest officials in Ireland, to adopt this new-light theologian (converted, after a fashion of his own, to the Church of Rome) as a profound divine, worthy of being placed at the head of an establishment for the education of the Catholic youth of Ireland? Is it possible that the Roman Catholic authorities in this country can approve of, and intend to adopt, Dr. Newman's novel views? In America, Roman Catholic writers have seen very plainly that Dr. Newman's views are quite inconsistent with those which represent Catholic truth as always the same, and as handed down unchanged, by tradition, from the earliest ages; but in this country, he is the selected instructor of the Catholic youths of Ireland notwithstanding, and publicly vaunted

as a man of the most profound wisdom and learning.

Is not this a proof how far toleration may be carried in the Church of Rome, where it suits her purpose, and when it is thought wise to conciliate an individual who is likely to be influential or useful in the maintenance of her system, on the terms merely that he is willing to "recognise the Church of Rome to be the mother and mistress of all Churches, and vow obedience, absolute and entire, to the Roman Pontiff, and confess as faith all that the Catholic Church teaches?"

Had the principles set forth in the essay on Development been published by a Protestant, the book would, doubtless, have been placed long since in the Index Prohibitorius; but, being written by one willing to acknowledge himself an obedient son of the Mother Church, he is vaunted as a profound divine, and inaugurated as the principal of a Catholic University.

Another instance will be in the minds of such of our readers as happened to peruse the observations of the Rambler on Dr. Cahill, copied by us in our February number.

Dr. Cahill had written on the doctrine of transubstantiation in a manner utterly heterodox and inconsistent with the teaching of the Council of Trent. The Rambler exposed his erroneous teaching in the strongest and clearest manner, and assured the world that a very large proportion of the Catholic clergy and laity regard much of what he says as pernicious and untrue! "Why, then, it will be said," continues the Rambler, "is Dr. Cahill allowed thus to compromise the whole community of which he is a member? Why do the bishops and clergy permit him to write and lecture as he does? Why do not those who disapprove come forward and protest against his being accepted as a model of a Catholic controversialist?"

The explanation of the Rambler is worthy of attention. It is as follows (p. 176):—

"We reply, that the common idea that Catholics are like a regiment of soldiers on the field of battle, every one of them acting in obedience to orders, is a pure figment of the Protestant imagination. Knowing that we have a discipline and code of law, that we do regard our bishops as the successors of the Apostles, and that we profess the utmost unity in matters of faith, the world jumps to the conclusion that every bishop is invested with power equivalent to the very highest which ultramontane theology ever attributed to the Pope himself. A Catholic bishop is not an autocrat with uncontrolled power over the actions of his spiritual subjects. He administers and enforces the laws of the Church, and beyond these, whatever power he has, is a species of moral influence, arising from the weight justly due to his sacred office and character. At the same time, the fact that it is a moral influence, and not a legal right (by the word *legal*, meaning a right secured by the laws of the Catholic Church), makes it necessary that it should be employed with great care and prudence, and not pushed too far, lest an unwilling subject recalibrate hopelessly. Accordingly, as a matter of history, we find that Catholic prelates—imitating the wisdom of the Holy See—are often backward in interposing in cases where Protestants expect their instant interference with the strong arm of authority, and if the future be like the past, this rule will continue to be observed to the end of all things."

Now, what is this, but simply that the Church is so tolerant, or rather so prudent, that she is ready to overlook anything in an unruly and unmanageable subject, even when confessedly propagating things, "*pernicious and untrue*," if he be only, willing, *nominally*, to submit himself to the *unexercised authority* of the Church and the Holy See.

The toleration, however, of the Church of Rome extends much farther than omitting to put in the Index Prohibitorius, books of an evil or erroneous tendency; it permits both bodies of men and individuals to teach, and inculcate in practice, many things quite at variance with her authorized dogmas and formularies.

We may instance the vast difference which she tolerates and connives at, between the theoretical and practical modes of invoking the saints. The former is laid down distinctly by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, part iv., chapter vi., question 3.—*Aliter Deum, aliter sanctos implor-*